

EXHIBIT 6

A law firm **built to win**



04 Who we are

12 What we do

14 How we do it

26 Our reputation

34 Case studies

**Dovel & Luner is a plaintiff's firm
that litigates high-stakes cases
in courts across the country.**



**We work on contingency and
are paid only for success.**



We win trials

We get big settlements

**Bloomberg
Law**

Jury Reaches \$925 Million Verdict in Telemarketing Case

Posted April 15, 2019, 8:41 AM



A federal jury has ordered a multi-level marketing company to pay \$925 million for making nearly 2 million unsolicited telemarketing calls to consumers promoting weight-loss products.

COMPUTERWORLD

IDG — the world's largest technology media company

SEMINAR & CIO

IT-CAREER

IT-HEALTH

IT-COURSE

IDG News Service >

Defendants to pay up to \$112 million in Power-over-Ethernet patent case

Jim Duffy
19.07.2010 14:20:38 | Network World (US)

AAA

Network-1 Security Solutions, an acquirer and licensor of intellectual property, says it has settled its Power-over-Ethernet patent infringement case against Cisco and five other companies.

Who we are

Greg Dovel

greg@dovel.com



Twenty-five years ago, Greg gave up his partnership at a name-brand firm to create a firm dedicated at its core to training excellent lawyers to win cases. He wanted to build a firm that would not bill hours and would only be paid for success—a firm that was built to win cases.

Greg's cross-examinations suck the air from the courtroom, demoralize opposing lawyers, and win cases. In court, it feels like magic. But magic has nothing to do with it. Greg's crosses are the result of thousands of hours spent practicing his trial skills and teaching others to do the same. None of those hours were billable. This could only be done at a firm like Dovel & Luner.

For an example of one of Greg's crosses, turn to page 21.

- Law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia (1987-88)
- Law clerk to Ninth Circuit Judge J. Clifford Wallace (1986-87)
- Harvard Law School (J.D., *magna cum laude*, 1986)
- Central Washington State University (B.A., *summa cum laude*, 1983)

"When you're not practicing, someone somewhere is. And when the two of you meet, the other person will win." – Bill Bradley

Sean Luner


sean@dovel.com



Sean is an expert in persuasion. He has been hired as a trial consultant to prepare opening statements and closing arguments in more than 100 trials by law firms such as O'Melveny & Myers, Irell & Manella, Paul Hastings, Winston & Strawn, and Greenberg Traurig. Sean uses that same skillset to persuade judges, juries and opposing parties that his own clients' claims are winners. This leads to exceptional results.

In one case that appeared to have an insurmountable problem, Sean was brought in weeks before trial. The client was facing a fraud claim for failing to disclose a troubling fact before the parties entered a business deal—that the client had pleaded guilty to drug smuggling and served years in prison. Through a series of focus groups, Sean developed an approach that turned that troubling fact in his client's favor. The jury came back with a fraud verdict, but not against Sean's client. It was against the other side:

- University of Southern California (J.D., Order of the Coif, 1992)
- University of Southern California (M.B.A., Beta Gamma Sigma, 1992)
- University of California at Los Angeles (B.S., 1988)



"Success is peace of mind, which is a direct result of self-satisfaction in knowing you made the effort to become the best of which you are capable." – John Wooden

Julien Adams

julien@dovel.com



Julien came to Dovel & Luner after six years as an Assistant United States Attorney, prosecuting government fraud and public corruption. As a federal prosecutor, Julien tried 21 jury trials, won them all, and received commendations from the FBI, IRS, and NASA.

After more than 25 years as a trial lawyer, Julien has mastered the art of framing a case to achieve victory. For example, Julien represented a solo entrepreneur in a multi-million dollar breach of contract case against a Fortune 100 company. Our client claimed the contract was a two-page document titled "Letter of Intent." The defendant asserted there was no contract. Our focus group testing showed that if jurors were asked to decide whether this document was a binding contract, they would hone in on the title, which said "Letter of Intent," not "Contract," and we would lose.

Julien reframed the issue. In his opening statement, he told jurors that they needed to decide whether the document was a "binding letter of intent" or a "non-binding letter of intent." The title became irrelevant. While the jury was deliberating, the defendant capitulated and agreed to a favorable settlement.

- Assistant U.S. Attorney (1995-2001)
- UC Berkeley School of Law (J.D., 1991)
- University of Southern California (B.A., 1988)

"The pursuit of truth will set you free; even if you never catch up with it." – Clarence Darrow

Jeff Eichmann

jeff@dovel.com



Early in his career, Jeff was handed an unwinnable case; yet he found a way to win. He has now done that so many times, it can't be luck. He wins by continuously focusing on a case's big picture while also mastering the fine details.

In state and federal courts across the country, Jeff has secured unprecedented trial wins and settlements against the world's largest and most sophisticated litigants, including Apple, HP, Dell, Sprint, and AT&T. In one case against Google, Jeff fought through layers of defenses and scorched earth tactics. He dug into Google's source code and documents and developed a clear and simple message to describe Google's wrong-doing that landed even with skeptical jurors. The result: the largest verdict ever against Google.

Google hit with \$85M infringement verdict



- Harvard Law School
(J.D., *magna cum laude*, 2003)
- Georgetown University
(B.A., *magna cum laude*,
Phi Beta Kappa, 2000)

"If you're paid before you walk on the court,
what's the point in playing as if your life
depended on it?" – Arthur Ashe

Christin Cho

christin@dovel.com



Christin has amassed a track record of success in all aspects of high-stakes litigation, from summary judgment motions to jury trials.

Christin excels at unpacking complex cases, finding a key point of vulnerability, and then creating a decisive attack on that point.

For example, in a case against a Silicon Valley giant, the defendant's key defense hinged on proving that "pattern matching" meant comparing wireless signal characteristics. Christin developed a cross-examination of the defendant's expert that included a series of simple questions that could only be answered one way. Christin walked the expert down this path, which ultimately led the expert to admit, unambiguously, that the defendant's key premise was false:

```
14           In the context of the claims, is it your
15 opinion that "pattern matching" means doing a
16 comparison of wireless signal characteristics?
17 A.      No
```

Victory for our client soon followed.



- Law clerk to Ninth Circuit Judge J. Clifford Wallace (2006-07)
- UC Berkeley School of Law (J.D., Order of the Coif, 2005)
- Amherst College (B.A., *cum laude*, 2001)

"Every day that you don't practice
is a day you're getting worse." – Amy Chua

Rick Lyon

rick@dovel.com



Rick is a fourth-generation lawyer. He is people savvy and especially adept at finding concrete details and turns of phrase that persuade judges and juries to find for our clients.

He is also adept at prevailing for his clients against seemingly difficult odds. He does this by deeply analyzing arguments, coming up with answers for all doubts, and crafting briefs and oral arguments that persuade judges and jurors.


For example, Mirror Worlds, a software startup, had a prior patent lawsuit against Apple that ended with a judgment of non-infringement. Then Dovel & Luner took the case. Rick filed a new lawsuit asserting that Apple continued to infringe the same patent. Naturally, Apple argued that the new case was barred: Apple's products had already been found not to infringe. Rick came up with a new infringement theory and convinced the district court that the earlier judgment did not bar the second lawsuit. Even more astounding, Rick persuaded the court that the earlier judgment did bar Apple's invalidity defenses. With no invalidity defense and facing a compelling infringement case, Apple settled the case on the eve of trial.

- Harvard Law School (J.D., *cum laude*, 2003)
- Stanford University (B.S., 2000)

"Truth, like gold, is to be obtained not by its growth, but by washing away from it all that is not gold." – Leo Tolstoy

Simon Franzini

simon@dovel.com



Simon excels at accurately analyzing complex facts and tangled legal issues and turning them into winning trial cases.

For example, our firm was brought in at the last minute to try a class action case in federal court in Oregon, alleging violations of consumer protection laws against robocalls. Because the case had been expected to settle, the deposition testimony was thin and no experts had been designated. The defendant became convinced it would win at trial and refused to settle.

Simon dove in and began stitching together evidence that would prove the case. For example, in the absence of a designated expert, he came up with a way to have a fact witness summarize the class-wide database evidence. And he took an old declaration offered by a defendant witness for a procedural issue, and used it as compelling proof that defendants made millions of illegal telemarketing calls. At trial, Simon delivered the closing argument on a Friday morning. That afternoon, the jury came back with a verdict:


- Harvard Law School (J.D., *magna cum laude*, 2012)
- New York University (B.A., *summa cum laude*, Phi Beta Kappa, 2009)

Jury Reaches \$925 Million Verdict in Telemarketing Case

“Practice isn’t the thing you do once you’re good. It’s the thing you do that makes you good.” – Malcolm Gladwell

Jonas Jacobson

jonas@dovel.com



Before joining Dovel & Luner, Jonas worked for five years as a jury consultant, conducting mock trials, witness preparation, and jury selection in cases ranging from securities fraud to patent infringement. He joined the firm because he wanted to do more than give advice to trial attorneys—he wanted to be one.

Since joining the firm, Jonas has excelled as an advocate. In his first three years, Jonas argued two appeals before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and won both. In another case, Jonas cross-examined the defendant's expert witness at trial and undermined each of the defendant's arguments. Jonas even got the expert to admit that one of the expert's main contentions was not only a "mistake," but that he had told the defendant's lawyers a "month or two" before trial that it "was false:"

18 Q I had to bring it out on cross, right, sir?
19 A Well, yes, and I am telling you that was my mistake.
20 Q When did you tell HP that what they had in this
21 contention was false?
22 A It may have been a month or two ago.

- Stanford Law School (J.D., Order of the Coif, 2009)
- Stanford University (M.A., psychology, 2009)
- Princeton University (B.A., *summa cum laude*, Phi Beta Kappa, 2005)

"The signal is the truth. The noise is what distracts us from the truth." – Nate Silver

What we do

We build **winning cases.**


For every client, we build a winning case for trial.
Because we build powerful cases, we often force large settlements shortly before or even during trial.

In our firm's 25-year history, we have obtained successful results for our clients in over 250 lawsuits.

We work on cases where more than \$25 million is at stake.

We work on contingency.

We have expertise in:



Business claims

- antitrust
- partnership and joint venture disputes
- unfair competition
- complex contract disputes
- fraud
- breach of fiduciary duty

Intellectual property

- trade secret theft
- patent infringement
- copyright infringement
- trademark infringement

Bankruptcy claims

- contract and business tort claims
- claims against directors and officers
- preference claims
- fraudulent transfers

Other high-stakes claims

- real estate litigation
- insurance coverage
- class actions
- arbitrations

How we do it

Our firm's primary advantage is that we are not designed to bill hours, we are **Built to Win**.



You are not going to get exceptional results if you hire a law firm that operates like every other law firm.

If you want exceptional results, you need to hire a firm that operates like no other law firm.

There are eight key elements to our success



Exceptional lawyers

Building a powerful case requires that each task and each decision come from an excellent lawyer, one with the highest skill levels in analysis, written and oral persuasion, and cross-examination.

We only have excellent lawyers.

We don't have a hiring quota for first-year lawyers that we have to fill each year. We only hire when a truly gifted lawyer comes along.



Calif. Firm Dovel & Luner Tops
Cravath With Higher Pay

Greg Dovel



Sean Luner



Jeff Eichmann



Julien Adams



Rick Lyon



Christin Cho



Simon Franzini



Jonas Jacobson



“Whether you are comparing arguments, briefs, or lawyers, a single excellent is a heavy favorite against ten ordinaries.” – Sean Luner

How we do it



Deliberate practice

Mastering persuasion requires continuous improvement. The science of expert performance calls this “deliberate practice.”

Our attorneys regularly engage in deliberate practice to improve their trial skills. In our Trial Lab, we drill trial and persuasion fundamentals and experiment with new techniques. We use practice materials designed specifically for improving skills, as well as scenarios taken from our current cases.

For example, before deposing an important witness, we practice the cross-examination in our lab. This hones cross-examination skills. It also allows us to discover new lines of inquiry and refine our approach to obtain key admissions that will be critical to our trial success.



“After I’d been a lawyer for 10 years, I was a very good cross-examiner. Ten years after that, after another decade of deliberate practice, I was even better. And today I am achieving my highest skill levels.”

– Greg Dovel



Experience



We staff our cases with only partners or with at least two partners for every associate.

As a result, our partners are not insulated from the details of the case. They know all the legal and factual nuances. They can write a better brief, take a better deposition, and make better strategic decisions.

The average years of experience for lawyers in a typical litigation department is 7.1 years. At our firm, the average experience is 15.2 years.

How we do it

4

Principles of persuasion

We apply principles of persuasion.


A “principle of persuasion” is a fundamental truth with broad application that will eliminate or mitigate doubts, causing the decision-maker (whether judge, jury, or opposing side) to adopt a more favorable view of your case.

We have identified these principles through academic and practical research, and we have refined our understanding of them as trial lawyers and trial consultants. We apply them consistently and successfully to build strong settlement positions for our clients and to prove their cases at trial.

Applying principles of persuasion, we achieve extraordinary results:



... including cases where we are brought in a few weeks before trial:



How we do it



Killer cross

For many lawyers, a successful cross-examination makes one or two points and avoids causing more harm than good. But that is not enough to achieve extraordinary results. Extraordinary results happen when a witness unequivocally gives up a key defense or the witness's credibility is destroyed to the extent that everyone in the courtroom knows the witness is lying.

We achieve extraordinary cross-examinations in every case, in depositions and at trial.



An example:

In a patent infringement case, defendant Cisco argued that our client's patent (the Katzenberg '930 patent) was invalid because it was just an obvious variation of an existing Cisco device invented by senior engineer Karl Nakamura.

Defendants' contentions

In summary, the Defendants contend as follows:

13. The '930 patent is invalid based on obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

On the third day of trial, the defendant called Mr. Nakamura to the stand to show how similar his idea was to the Katzenberg '930 patent. His testimony was persuasive. But then we got a chance to cross-examine him. Fifteen minutes later, Mr. Nakamura admitted:

12 Q And the approach of sending a low level
13 current, as in the '930 patent, was not obvious,
14 right?
15 A That's correct.

16 Q And if the Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury
17 agree with you, then this patent is certainly valid,
18 right?
19 A Well, it's certainly valid.

The result:**COMPUTERWORLD**

IDG — the world's largest technology media company

SEMINAR & CIO

IT-CAREER

IT-HEALTH

IT-COURSE

[IDG News Service >](#)

**Defendants to pay up to \$112 million in
Power-over-Ethernet patent case**

How we do it


6

Winning briefs

Our briefs directly take on our opponents' best arguments and destroy them with clear, powerful logic.

10 THE COURT: The judge made it with prejudice rather than
11 without prejudice.
12 MR. DOVEL: That's right. That's a very common...
13 THE COURT: But you're saying it has no other
14 significance beyond that?
15 MR. DOVEL: None, your Honor. None, your Honor. We
16 cite case after case in our brief from the Courts of Appeal that
17 hold that.
18 THE COURT: I thought your gray brief was particularly
19 clear and powerful on that point - even more than the blue brief.
20 MR. DOVEL: Yeah, we did hit it very hard your Honor.

Chief Judge Paul Michel, United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
Media Techs. v. Upper Deck Co., 334 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2003)





“They’re smart and always prepared,” the judge said.
“Their written work product was second to none.”

“Beyond Stellar,” *Daily Journal*, July 23, 2018
(quoting former Magistrate Judge in the Eastern District of Texas)


How we do it



Visual Victory

In a complex trial, a winning case is built with visuals.

We design our visuals in-house, so that we can seamlessly integrate our graphics with our arguments. Other litigators recognize our skill with visual strategies and hire our in-house trial consulting division, Visual Victory, for their cases.



There is no question that your work had a major impact on Judge Robert E. Jones. You will remember that at the end of the closing arguments, he asked us for a copy of our closing argument presentation. We found out later that he took the CD-Rom to the Oregon Bar Association's annual convention and presented it at a workshop on the use of cutting edge technology in the court room. We believe that he was particularly impressed with the way you set up the closing argument presentation so that we presented the law to him, then a summary of our evidence, and finally video out takes in which the plaintiffs made key admissions. You may not know that he later told us in open court that he had described our closing to other judges as a "Rhetorical Rembrandt." I may have been the orator but you are clearly the artist. Thank you.


LTP:law



Paid only for success

We structure all of our fee agreements so that we get paid to win cases, not to bill hours. We do this because lawyers should be compensated for obtaining excellent results for their clients, not merely for billing time.


We regularly take cases on a full contingency-fee basis, including covering all case expenses. We do not represent clients on an hourly-fee basis.





“Lawyers with a direct economic incentive to win will deploy a team whose day-to-day focus is on actions that lead to winning.” - Christin Cho

Our reputation



What clients say:




Usually a firm that is at the top of their field in one area is weak in another. This is not the case with Dovel & Luner—they are outstanding across every aspect of litigation, from case preparation and legal strategy, through motion practice, witness examination, oral argument, and negotiation. High-stakes litigation is intense, stressful, and risky. There were many times when if we had had lost a single motion, it would have destroyed the value of our case. Thanks to Dovel & Luner, we never lost one of those motions.



What **clients** say:



Dovel & Luner has assembled an elite 'special forces' team of attorneys. Each attorney at Dovel & Luner is highly credentialed. The firm has three partners for every associate and their experience level vastly exceeds the attorneys from opposing law firms that I see them go up against. I have witnessed first-hand Dovel & Luner's most junior lawyers out-perform top partners at national name-brand law firms by executing devastating cross examinations at trial and delivering superb arguments at the Federal Circuit and United States Patent Office.




Our reputation


What colleagues say:



As we stated in the employment application, we approached Dovel & Luner because of your firm's ability to effectively try complex cases on a contingency basis. Your firm lived up to our expectations – you were able to quickly digest the facts and develop arguments that allowed us to obtain an excellent result for our client.



What colleagues say:



It is difficult to find a high quality lawyer for clients who need a contingency fee law firm to handle complex business litigation or an intellectual property lawsuit. You know that I believe you have the experience, judgment, and talent required to litigate these complex, big dollar cases and win. As a result, I have no hesitation in referring and have been happy to refer such matters to your firm, and will continue to do so in the future.



Our reputation

What jurors say:


TO: Don Rosen
FROM: Gretchen Parker
Foreperson
RE: John Morrison vs Russell & Rusty West
DATE: January 20, 2000
FAX: 213-955-9886
I have not been able to reach Linda or Ann so I'm just
going to wing this. I must have destroyed all of my
trial notes and names are fuzzy. I hope I'm not too
convinced

In our discussions the graphics were a blessing in putting thoughts into a perspective that could be easily understood. The APPLE TREE was most helpful in explaining what seemed to be an enormous amount of money to those jurors who were completely unfamiliar with sales, specifically commission sales. They could relate to apple trees having to form and grow before they bear fruit -- the fruit being the reward of careful preparation, nourishment and nurturing.

P.S. I'd love to see the outcome
ever materialized.




What jury experts say:



What attorney doesn't want his or her opening statement to be the trial story against which all evidence is measured? After 28 years as a trial consulting firm, we have found no other trial team able to make this goal pay off as consistently as your trial team at Dovel & Luner.

Our reputation


What opponents say:



Defendant's closing argument
Sun Celebrity Holdings v. Celebrity, Inc.



What **opponents** say:



Defendant's deposition testimony describing Dovel & Luner's closing argument in a previous case

Case studies

A key test of our abilities


The acid test for a law firm is whether it can take over a case shortly before trial and win. Can the firm understand the nuances of the case, uncover new insights in the evidence and arguments, develop a solid damages analysis, finish any remaining depositions and expert reports, win the key motions, prepare winning trial examination outlines and visuals, and do so in only a very short period of time?

We can.




Case study 1

The client (CASI) went into bankruptcy. Lockheed sued the client and the client responded with its own counterclaims. After intensive litigation, the client did not have the money to continue to pursue its claim on an hourly basis. The trial was rapidly approaching.




21 7. Debtor believes it is necessary to associate in special litigation counsel in
22 the Lockheed Action to work with Sulmeyer, Kupetz, Baumann & Rothman ("SKB&R") to bring
23 this case to trial. The depositions and documentary evidence in this case are voluminous and
24 complicated and will require substantial work to organize for trial.




Who do you turn to as trial approaches?



20 6. CASI files this Application to retain Dovel & Luner ("Dovel") to take the
21 lead role. Dovel & Luner is a unique firm which specializes in involving itself in cases which are
22 near trial. Its lawyers have extensive trial experience.




The Result:



24 440. Based on the foregoing, CASI is entitled to recover from Lockheed a total of
25 \$13,746,477, as follows:

- 1 • \$7,164,318 in punitive damages resulting from Lockheed's fraudulent conduct
- 2 associated with the June 3 letter; plus



“Judges generally take away punitive damages awards.
It takes exceptional lawyering for a judge to award
punitive damages.”

Judge Robert M. Parker,
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, retired.



DAILY JOURNAL EXTRA

LITIGATION FILES

Judge Orders Lockheed to Pay \$16.2 Million

By Eron Ben-Yehuda

A Los Angeles bankruptcy judge rebuked the Lockheed Martin Corp. recently, ordering the company to pay \$7 million in punitive damages on a fraud claim.

In his written opinion after a bench trial, U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Thomas B.

nesses often appeared to be evasive and to give less than candid testimony," the April 29 opinion stated. "When challenged on cross-examination with evidence that contradicted their previous written declaration, Lockheed witnesses sometimes appeared to respond with new, unconvincing testimony that seemed to be an attempt to cover up the contradictions in

on litigation, Lockheed Martin intends to appeal this decision," Jan Gottfredsen says. "We have no further comment."

Computer Aided System's attorney Gregory S. Dovel says he's struck by the candor of Donovan's decision.

"He didn't pull punches," says Dovel of Santa Monica's Dovel & Luner.

In 1998, Lockheed hired Computer

Case study 2

A high-stakes class action case alleging that the defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act was two months away from trial.

Who do you turn to as trial approaches?

Scott F. Kocher, OSB#015088
Stephen J. Voorhes, OSB#150595
FORBUSH LAW GROUP
811 S.W. Naito Parkway, Suite 420
Portland, Oregon 97204
Tel: 503.445.2120
Fax: 503.445.2120

4. In preparation for the upcoming trial and in order to better serve Plaintiff and the Robocall Class, Class Counsel began working with attorneys at Dovel & Luner who have a well-known record of winning complex cases at trial. (*See generally*, Declaration of Jonas Jacobson.) Subsequently, Plaintiff retained Dovel and Luner to assist Class Counsel in the pursuit of her claims. (*Id.* ¶ 2.)

9. Greg Dovel, Jonas Jacobson, and Simon Franzini all have extensive experience in preparing and trying complex litigation in federal court. (*Id.* ¶ 3.)

UNOPPOSED MTS. TO APPOINT
CO-LEAD CLASS COUNSEL

The Result:

**Bloomberg
Law**

Jury Reaches \$925 Million Verdict in Telemarketing Case

Posted April 15, 2019, 8:41 AM



A federal jury has ordered a multi-level marketing company to pay \$925 million for making nearly 2 million unsolicited telemarketing calls to consumers promoting weight-loss products.



We get excellent results

If you know of someone with a high value matter who needs elite contingency-fee counsel, we would appreciate your referral.